

On the role of designs in the data-driven approach to quantum statistical inference

Michele Dall'Arno^{1,2}

¹Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Toyohashi University of Technology, Toyohashi, Japan

²Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

Designs, and in particular symmetric, informationally complete (SIC) structures, play an important role in the quantum tomographic reconstruction process and, by extension, in certain interpretations of quantum theory focusing on such a process. This fact is due to the symmetry of the reconstruction formula that designs lead to. However, it is also known that the same tomographic task, albeit with a less symmetric formula, can be accomplished by any informationally complete (non necessarily symmetric) structure. Here we show that, if the tomographic task is replaced by a data-driven inferential approach, the reconstruction, while possible with designs, cannot be accomplished anymore by an arbitrary informationally complete structure. Hence, we propose the data-driven inference as the arena in which the role of designs naturally emerges. Our inferential approach is based on a minimality principle according to which, among all the possible inferences consistent with the data, the weakest should be preferred, in the sense of majorization theory and statistical comparison.

1 Introduction

We consider the scenario in which a correlation (i.e. a conditional probability distribution) between an input and an output is given. We regard this correlation as generated by some (unspecified) quantum measurement upon the input of some (also unspecified) states. In this context, we say that a measurement is *consistent* with the given correlation if there exist states upon the input of which the measurement produces the correlation. Generally speaking, our aim is to produce an inference for a consistent measurement (of course, we could adopt the opposite approach of inferring the states). However, the measurement consistent with any given correlation is, of course, in general not unique. How should we proceed?

For instance, the protocol of quantum measurement tomography [1, 2] addresses this issue by additionally

imposing that the given correlation has been generated by a given set of states. The linearity of the theory allows then in principle to recover the measurement by linear inversion. Of course, in this case the set of states cannot itself be obtained via quantum state tomography, because the latter, in a symmetric fashion, would require an assumption on the measurement which, by definition of our problem, is instead unspecified and the target of the inference. In other words, tomography cannot “bootstrap” itself.

In this work we adopt a different approach, reminiscent of Jaynes’ maximum entropy principle [3, 4]. Among all measurements consistent with the given correlation, we infer the *minimally committal* ones, that is, informally, those that are consistent with as little else as possible other than the given correlation. We formalize the committal degree of a measurement by regarding each measurement as a map [5] assigning a probability distribution (on the measurement outcomes) to any state. The probability range of a measurement is therefore the set of all correlations a measurement is consistent with, and our goal becomes to find the measurements whose range, while still including the given correlations, is minimal in volume. Since this inferential protocol does not require any additional input other than the given correlation, it is referred to as data-driven [6], and it can be used for instance to bootstrap the tomographic protocol in the sense discussed above.

The choice of comparing measurements based on their range is based on the operational role of the range in majorization theory and statistical comparison [7, 8]. Indeed, for any two measurements, range inclusion is a necessary and sufficient condition for one measurement to be able to simulate the other through a suitable statistical transformation [9, 10, 11]. In this sense, our goal can be reframed as finding, among all the measurements consistent with the given correlations, the most universally simulable.

This optimization problem has already been solved, for any given correlation, for the case of qubit measurements [12, 13]. Here, we address the arbitrary dimensional case. Our main result consists of showing that any measurement that produces the given correlation upon the input of a spherical 2-design set of states is minimally committal. Technically, the main ingredient in our proof is a result within John’s

Michele Dall'Arno: michele.dallarno.mv@tut.jp

arXiv:2304.13258v1 [quant-ph] 26 Apr 2023

theory [14] on minimum volume enclosing ellipsoids. In this sense, the data-driven inference protocol, although by definition a search for the least committal measurement, turns out to be equivalent to the linear inversion at the hearth of measurement tomography under the hypothesis that the set of states forms a design.

At the foundational level, our results shines new light on the role played by symmetric, informationally complete (SIC) structures, and more generally designs and the class of morphophoric measurements [15, 16] recently introduced by Slomczyński and Szymusiak, in the quantum Bayesian interpretation (QBism) [17, 18, 19] of quantum theory. So-far, such a role has been justified based on the symmetry of the tomographic reconstruction formula (inherited by the symmetry of the structures themselves) when such structures are adopted. However, any informationally complete (not necessarily symmetric) structure is universal for tomographic reconstruction, albeit with a less-symmetric formula. Instead, if the tomographic task is replaced with the data-driven inferential task we consider, as a consequence of our result not any informationally complete structure will do, and thus the role of designs emerges naturally.

2 Formalization

In order to introduce the data-driven inference map, it is convenient to formulate operational concepts from quantum theory, such as states and measurements, in geometrical terms. Table 1 provides conversions between the Hilbert-space formalism and the geometrical formalism of quantum theory. Figure 1 provides a

	Hilbert form.	Geom.
Lin. space	Hermitian $d \times d$	$\mathbb{R}^{\ell=d^2}$
Unit effect	$\mathbb{1}_d$	\mathbf{u}_ℓ
Normalization	$\text{Tr}[\rho] = 1$	$\mathbf{u}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{s} = 1$
Measur.	$\sum_{j=1}^n \pi_j = \mathbb{1}_d$	$M^T \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_\ell$
Inner prod.	Hilbert-Schmidt	Dot prod.
Born rule	$p_j = \text{Tr}[\rho \pi_j]$	$\mathbf{p} = M\mathbf{s}$
Purity	$\text{Tr}[\rho^2]$	$ \mathbf{s} ^2$

Table 1: Conversion table between the Hilbert-space formalism and the geometrical formalism of quantum theory.

quick overview of the geometrical formalism of quantum theory. States can be represented by real vectors in an ℓ -dimensional real space. An n -outcome quasi-measurement M is an $n \times \ell$ real matrix that associates to any state \mathbf{s} the quasi-probability distribution

$$\mathbf{p} := M\mathbf{s}, \quad (1)$$

that is, the entries of \mathbf{p} sum up to the unity, but are not necessarily positive. The relaxation of the pos-




Figure 1: Geometrical formalism of quantum theory. Left side: the linear space of states and effects, including the unit effect \mathbf{u}_ℓ , the hyperplane $\mathbf{u}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{s} = 1$ where states lie, and the ball \mathbb{B} on whose surface pure states lie. Right side: the probability space, including the vector \mathbf{u}_n with unit elements, the hyperplane $\mathbf{u}_n \cdot \mathbf{p} = 1$ where probability distributions lie, and the extremal probability distributions. Any measurement M is a map from the set \mathbb{S} of admissible states to the probability space.

itivity constraint is typical of inferential protocols – for example, it is shared by the linear inversion at the heart of quantum tomography –, and is usually remedied by a successive search of the closest positivity-preserving measurement, according to some relevant operational criterion. A quasi-measurement M is said to be consistent with quasi-probability distribution \mathbf{p} if and only if there exists state \mathbf{s} that generates \mathbf{p} when measured by M , as per Eq. (1). The existence of a unit measurement, say \mathbf{u}_ℓ , such that

$$\mathbf{u}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{s} = 1, \quad (2)$$

for any state \mathbf{s} , implies that the set \mathbb{S} of admissible states lies on the hyper-plane orthogonal to \mathbf{u}_ℓ . We will assume, without loss of generality, that \mathbb{S} is a spanning set of \mathbb{R}^ℓ . Upon choosing $\mathbf{u}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ and $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to be the vectors whose elements are all ones, the hyper-plane of states and the hyper-plane of quasi-probability distributions coincide, which will allow for a unified discussion. The fact that for any state \mathbf{s} one has $\mathbf{u}_n^T M\mathbf{s} = 1$ is equivalent to the condition

$$M^T \mathbf{u}_n = M^+ M \mathbf{u}_\ell, \quad (3)$$

where M^+ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. From Eq. (1), informational completeness (IC) is equivalent to the condition that M is left invertible, that is, $M^+ M = \mathbb{1}_\ell$, where $\mathbb{1}_\ell$ denotes the $\ell \times \ell$ identity operator, and hence $n \geq \ell$. For any IC quasi-measurement M one has that $(\det M^T M)^{1/2}$ denotes, up to a constant factor, the volume of its probability range.

For any spanning set $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$ of admissible states and any set $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ of probability distributions spanning an ℓ -dimensional subspace, we denote with $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P})$ the set of quasi-measurements from \mathbb{S} consistent with \mathcal{P} , that is

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P}) := \left\{ M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell} \mid M^T \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_\ell \wedge \mathcal{P} \subseteq M\mathbb{S} \right\}.$$

We are now in a position to introduce the data-driven inference map that, upon the input of any set of probability distributions, outputs the set of quasi-measurements that are consistent with the input and minimally committal.

Definition 1 (Data-driven inference). *Upon the input of any set \mathcal{P} of quasi-probability distributions spanning \mathbb{R}^ℓ , the output of the data-driven inference map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})$ is the set of quasi-measurements consistent with \mathcal{P} with minimum-volume probability range, that is*

$$\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P}) := \underset{M \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})}{\text{argmin}} \det M^T M. \quad (4)$$

3 Main result

In order to introduce our main result, we need to formulate some additional operational concept from quantum theory in geometrical terms. The purity of a state \mathbf{s} coincides with its squared norm $|\mathbf{s}|^2$. Pure states, that is states with unit purity $|\mathbf{s}|^2 = 1$, lie on the surface of the ball \mathbb{B} obtained intersecting the linear constraint in Eq. (2) with the cone, whose axis is \mathbf{u}_ℓ , given by

$$f(\mathbf{v}) := |\mathbf{v}|^2 - (\mathbf{u}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{v})^2 \leq 0. \quad (5)$$

Notice that such a ball \mathbb{B} is in general a superset of the set \mathbb{S} of admissible states. A probability distribution p over a set \mathcal{S} of states is a spherical 2-design if and only if it is indistinguishable from the uniform distribution on the surface of \mathbb{B} when given two copies. In formula

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} p(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s} = \int O(\mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s}) O^T dO, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{s} in the right-hand side is any pure state, O denotes any orthogonal matrix such that $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell^T O \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell = 1$ (we write $\hat{\cdot}$ to denote the unit vector), and dO denotes the invariant measure on the orthogonal group $O(\ell - 1)$ in the subspace of \mathbb{R}^ℓ satisfying Eq. (2).

We are now in a position to state our main result, that shows that the quasi-measurements that output the given set of probability distributions upon the input of a spherical 2-design are minimally committal.

Theorem 1. *Upon the input of any set \mathcal{P} of quasi-probability distributions spanning \mathbb{R}^ℓ , quasi-measurement M belongs to the output of the data driven inference map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})$ if the counter-image \mathcal{S} of \mathcal{P} , that is*

$$\mathcal{P} = M\mathcal{S}, \quad (7)$$

supports a spherical 2-design.

Notice that Eq. (7) represents a closed-form characterization of M whenever \mathcal{P} contains ℓ linearly independent probability distributions. Indeed, in this case the only \mathcal{S} that supports a spherical 2-design is the regular simplex, and Eq. (7) can be inverted to explicitly obtain M .

4 Proof of main result

The following commuting diagram summarizes the statement of Thm. 1 (left vertical arrow), as well as the statements of the three Lemmas (horizontal and right vertical arrows) in which we split its proof.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S} \text{ sph. 2-design} & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Lemma 1}} & O(\ell - 1) \subseteq \text{ddi}_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{S}) \\ \text{Thm. 1} \Downarrow & & \text{Lemma 2} \Downarrow \\ M \in \text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P}) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Lemma 3}} & \mathbb{1}_\ell \in \text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S}) \end{array} .$$

Notice that, on the right hand side of the diagram (that is, in the three lemmas), the ddi map is applied to the set \mathcal{S} of states, rather than to a set of probability distributions. This is consistent with our choice of representing states as probability distributions, as per Eq. (2).

First, we modify a proof technique used [14] in the related context of minimum volume enclosing ellipsoids to show that spherical 2-designs lead to a sufficient condition for the inclusion of the orthogonal group in the output of the data-driven inference on the ball of pure states. Measurements corresponding to orthogonal matrices are symmetric, informationally complete (SIC).

Lemma 1. *Upon the input of any set \mathcal{S} of states that supports a spherical design, the output of the data-driven inference map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{S})$ on the ball \mathbb{B} includes any orthogonal matrix O such that $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell^T O \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell = 1$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{S} supports a spherical 2-design, \mathcal{S} is a spanning set of \mathbb{R}^ℓ , and hence any M in the domain of optimization is an ℓ -outcomes invertible quasi-measurement. For any ℓ -outcome invertible quasi-measurement M the condition $\mathcal{S} \subseteq M\mathbb{B}$ is equivalent to the condition $M^{-1}\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{B}$, which in turn is equivalent to the conditions $f(M^{-1}\mathbf{s}) \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_\ell \cdot \mathbf{s} = 1$ for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$. From Eq. (5) one immediately has

$$0 \geq f(\mathbf{s}) = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s}] - \mathbf{u}_\ell^T (\mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s}) \mathbf{u}_\ell.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq f(M^{-1}\mathbf{s}) \\ &= \text{Tr}[M^{-1}(\mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s})M^{-T}] - \mathbf{u}_\ell^T M^{-1}(\mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s})M^{-T} \mathbf{u}_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 5 there exists probability distribution p such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} p(\mathbf{s}) f(M^{-1}\mathbf{s}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell} (\text{Tr}[M^{-1}M^{-T}] - \mathbf{u}_\ell^T M^{-1}M^{-T} \mathbf{u}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 4 also M^{-1} is a quasi-measurement, hence $M^{-T} \mathbf{u}_\ell = \mathbf{u}_\ell$. Since $|\mathbf{u}_\ell|^2 = \ell$ one has

$$0 \geq \text{Tr}[M^{-1}M^{-T}] - \ell = \text{Tr}[M^{-1}M^{-T} - \mathbb{1}_\ell]. \quad (8)$$

Notice that, for any $X > 0$, one has $\text{Tr}[X - \mathbb{1}_\ell] \geq \log \det X$, with equality if and only if $X = \mathbb{1}_\ell$. Using this fact, from Eq. (8) one has the following majorization

$$0 \geq \ln \det M^{-1}M^{-T},$$

or equivalently

$$\det M^T M \geq 1. \quad (9)$$

Summarizing, Eq. (9) shows that, for any ℓ -outcome quasi-measurement M in the domain of optimization of $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{S})$, that is $\mathcal{S} \subseteq M\mathbb{B}$, the cost function, that is $\det M^T M$, attains a value larger than or equal to one, that is the value attained by the orthogonal group, thus proving the statement. \square

Notice that also the reverse of Lemma 1 can be proved by similarly modifying a proof technique used in Ref. [14]; however, since such a statement is not necessary in order to prove Theorem 1, we omit such a proof here.

Next, we show that an outer approximation of the set of admissible states in terms of the ball of pure states leads to a sufficient condition for the inclusion of quasi-measurement $\mathbb{1}_\ell$ (the $\ell \times \ell$ identity operator) in the output of the data-driven inference map.

Lemma 2. *Upon the input of any given set \mathcal{S} of states, if the output of the data-driven inference map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{S})$ on the ball \mathbb{B} includes the quasi-measurement $\mathbb{1}_\ell$, then the output of the data-driven inference map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S})$ on the set \mathbb{S} of admissible states also includes the quasi-measurement $\mathbb{1}_\ell$.*

Proof. To prove the statement, we proceed by reductio ad absurdum.

Since by negation of the thesis $\mathbb{1}_\ell \notin \text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S})$, either i) $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$, or ii) there exists a quasi-measurement $M \in \text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S})$ such that the value of the cost function in M is strictly smaller than the value in $\mathbb{1}_\ell$, that is, $\det M^T M < \det \mathbb{1}_\ell = 1$. Since \mathcal{S} is a subset of \mathbb{S} , the quasi-measurement $\mathbb{1}_\ell$ is a feasible point of the optimization of $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S})$, thus excluding alternative i) and leaving us with alternative ii).

Since any set \mathbb{S} of admissible states is a subset of the ball \mathbb{B} on whose surface pure states lie, that is $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{B}$, from the consistency condition $\mathcal{S} \subseteq M\mathbb{S}$ one has $\mathcal{S} \subseteq M\mathbb{B}$. Hence, quasi-measurement M is a feasible point of the optimization of $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{S})$. Since $\det M^T M < \det \mathbb{1}_\ell = 1$, one has that $\mathbb{1}_\ell \notin \text{ddi}_{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{S})$, that contradicts the hypothesis. \square

Notice that reversing the logical implication of Lemma 2 the statement fails in general; therefore, Lemma 2 is the reason why the logical implication of Theorem 1 is one-way only for arbitrary dimension. However, for qubits it is clear that the logical implication of Lemma 2 can be reversed, leading in this case

to a complete characterization of minimally committal measurements in terms of spherical 2-designs.

Third, we recast the inclusion of any given quasi-measurement in the output of the data-driven inference map as the inclusion of measurement $M = \mathbb{1}_\ell$ in the output of the data-driven inference map.

Lemma 3. *Upon the input of any set \mathcal{P} of probability distributions spanning an ℓ -dimensional space, quasi-measurement M belongs to the output of the map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})$ if and only if upon the input of the set \mathcal{S} of states, quasi-measurement $\mathbb{1}_\ell$ belongs to the output of the map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{S})$, where \mathcal{S} is given by Eq. (7).*

Proof. The proof is split in two parts. In the first part, we prove that quasi-measurement M is bijective from the optimization domain $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(M^+\mathcal{P})$ of map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(M^+\mathcal{P})$ to the optimization domain $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})$ of map $\text{ddi}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})$. In the second part, we prove that quasi-measurement M preserves the ordering induced by the cost function given by the range volume.

For any quasi-measurement $L \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(M^+\mathcal{P})$ one has that:

- ML is informationally complete, that is, $(ML)^+(ML) = \mathbb{1}_\ell$, as it immediately follows from the informational completeness of M and L .
- ML is a quasi-measurement, that is, $(ML)^T \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_\ell$. Indeed

$$(ML)^T \mathbf{u}_n = L^T M^T \mathbf{u}_n = L^T \mathbf{u}_\ell = \mathbf{u}_\ell,$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $M^T \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_\ell$ and the third equality follows from the fact that $L^T \mathbf{u}_\ell = \mathbf{u}_\ell$.

- ML is consistent with \mathcal{P} , that is $\mathcal{P} \subseteq MLS$. Indeed, from the hypothesis $M^+\mathcal{P} \subseteq LS$ one has $MM^+\mathcal{P} \subseteq MLS$, and from the fact that $MM^+\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$ one has $\mathcal{P} \subseteq MLS$.

Hence

$$MM_{\mathbb{S}}(M^+\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P}). \quad (10)$$

Since $M^+M = \mathbb{1}_\ell$, from Eq. (10) one also has

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(M^+\mathcal{P}) \subseteq M^+\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P}). \quad (11)$$

For any quasi-measurement $N \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathcal{P})$ one has that:

- M^+N is informationally complete, that is, $(M^+N)^+(M^+N) = \mathbb{1}_\ell$. Indeed

$$(M^+N)^+(M^+N) = N^+MM^+N = N^+N = \mathbb{1}_\ell,$$

where the second equality follows from the facts that $MM^+\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$ and $NN^+\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$.

- M^+N is a quasi-measurement, that is, $(M^+N)^T \mathbf{u}_\ell = \mathbf{u}_\ell$. Indeed

$$(M^+N)^T \mathbf{u}_\ell = N^T M M^+ \mathbf{u}_n = N^T \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_\ell,$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 4, the second equality follows from the fact that $MM^+N = N$, and the third equality follows from the fact that $N^T \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_\ell$.

- M^+N is consistent with $M^+\mathcal{P}$, that is $M^+\mathcal{P} \subseteq M^+N\mathbb{S}$, as it immediately follows from the hypothesis $\mathcal{P} \subseteq N\mathbb{S}$.

Hence

$$M^+ \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(M^+\mathcal{P}). \quad (12)$$

Since $M^+MN = N$ for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$, from Eq. (12) one also has

$$\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq MM_\mathbb{S}(M^+\mathcal{P}). \quad (13)$$

Combining Eqs. (12), (10), (11), and (13), one immediately has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(M^+\mathcal{P}) &= M^+ \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P}), \\ \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P}) &= MM_\mathbb{S}(M^+\mathcal{P}), \end{aligned}$$

that is, quasi-measurement M is bijective from $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(M^+\mathcal{P})$ to $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P})$, which concludes the first part of the proof.

For any quasi-measurement $L \in \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(M^+\mathcal{P})$ by explicit computation one has that

$$\det(ML)^T(ML) = \det M^T M \det L^T L.$$

For any quasi-measurement $N \in \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{P})$ one has that

$$\begin{aligned} &\det(M^+N)^T(M^+N) \\ &= \det N^T(M^+)^T M^+N \\ &= \det O^T D^T V^T W^T E^T U^T U E W V D O \\ &= \det D^T (V^T W^T E^T E W V) D \\ &= \det D^T D \det E^T E \\ &= (\det M^T M)^{-1} \det N^T N, \end{aligned}$$

where we made use of the singular value decompositions $N = VDO$ and $M^+ = UEW$ for some orthogonal matrices $O, U \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times \ell}$, some isometries $V, W^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}$, and some diagonal matrices $D, E \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times \ell}$, and we have used the fact that, since $\mathcal{P} \subseteq N\mathbb{S}$ and $\mathcal{P} = M\mathbb{S}$, one has $NN^+ = MM^+$ and hence $VV^+ = W^+W$, thus $WV = \mathbb{1}_\ell$.

Since $\det M^T M$ is a positive constant factor, quasi-measurement M preserves the ordering induced by the cost function, which concludes the proof. \square

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

5 Conclusions and open problems

In this work we showed that a data-driven approach to quantum statistical inference is possible with designs and cannot be accomplished by arbitrary informationally complete structures, thus suggesting that data-driven inference, more than quantum tomography, should be regarded as the scenario in which the role of designs naturally emerges. Similarly to Jaynes' maximum entropy principle, our inferential approach is based on a minimality principle according to which, among all the possible inferences consistent with the data, the weakest should be preferred, in the sense of majorization theory and statistical comparison.

To conclude, we believe it would be relevant to extend our analysis of the role played by symmetric structures in the data-driven inference to the morphophoric structures [15, 16] recently introduced and studied by Slomczyński and A. Szymusiak. Indeed, such structures generalize designs in a way that preserves at least some of the properties analyzed in this work.

6 Acknowledgments

M. D. acknowledges support from Toyohashi University of Technology, the international research unit in Quantum Information in Kyoto University, the MEXT Quantum Leap Flagship Program (MEXT Q-LEAP) Grant No. JPMXS0118067285, and the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP20K03774.

A Properties of measurements and designs

In this section we present some elementary properties of quasi-measurements and spherical 2-designs that we used in the main text.

Lemma 4 (Closure under inversion). *The set of quasi-measurements is closed under pseudoinversion, that is, for any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}$ such that $M^T \mathbf{u}_n = M^+ M \mathbf{u}_\ell$, one also has $(M^+)^T \mathbf{u}_\ell = M M^+ \mathbf{u}_n$.*

Proof. By hypothesis one has

$$M^T \mathbf{u}_n = M^+ M \mathbf{u}_\ell.$$

By multiplying from the left by $(M^+)^T$ one has

$$(M^+)^T M^T \mathbf{u}_n = (M^+)^T M^+ M \mathbf{u}_\ell.$$

By using the identities $(M^+)^T M^T = M M^+$ and $(M^+)^T M^+ M = (M^+)^T$ one has

$$(M^+)^T \mathbf{u}_\ell = M M^+ \mathbf{u}_n,$$

which proves the statement. \square

Lemma 5 (Spherical 2-designs). *For any spherical 2-design p over a set \mathcal{S} of states one has*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} p(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s} = \frac{\mathbb{1}_\ell}{\ell}.$$

Proof. From the invariance under transformations in the orthogonal group $O(\ell - 1)$, the right-hand side of Eq. (6) is given by

$$\int O(\mathbf{s} \otimes \mathbf{s}) O^T dO = \lambda(\mathbb{1}_\ell - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell \otimes \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell) + \nu \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell \otimes \hat{\mathbf{u}}_\ell, \quad (14)$$

for some constants λ and ν . Constant ν can be obtained by multiplying both sides of Eq. (14) by \mathbf{u}_ℓ^T to the left and by \mathbf{u}_ℓ to the right. From Eq. (2), the left-hand side equals one. Hence one has $1 = \nu|\mathbf{u}_\ell|^2$, and since $|\mathbf{u}_\ell|^2 = \ell$ one has $\nu = 1/\ell$. Constant λ can be obtained by tracing both sides of Eq. (14). Since for pure states one has $|\mathbf{s}|^2 = 1$, the left-hand side equals one. Hence one has $1 = \lambda(\ell - 1) + \nu$, or equivalently $\lambda = \nu = 1/\ell$. \square

Notice that the statement of Lemma 5 immediately follows from the fact (not assumed in the proof) that regular simplices are spherical 2-designs. In this case, as exemplified by Fig. 1, it suffices to consider the regular simplex of probability distributions to immediately prove the statement of the lemma.

References

- [1] A. Luis and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, *Complete characterization of arbitrary quantum measurement processes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3573 (1999).
- [2] A. Bisio, G. Chiribella, G. M. D’Ariano, S. Facchini, and P. Perinotti, *Optimal quantum tomography of states, measurements, and transformations*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 010404 (2009).
- [3] E. T. Jaynes, *Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, *Physical Review Series II* **106**, 620 (1957).
- [4] E. T. Jaynes, *Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, *Physical Review Series II* **108**, 171 (1957).
- [5] M. Ozawa, *Optimal measurements for general quantum systems*, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* **18**, 11 (1980).
- [6] F. Buscemi and M. Dall’Arno, *Device-Independent Inference of Physical Devices: Theory and Implementation*, *New J. Phys.* **21**, 113029 (2019).
- [7] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*, **143** (Springer, 1979).
- [8] E. Torgersen, *Comparison of Statistical Experiments*, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications* (Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- [9] F. Buscemi, M. Keyl, G. M. D’Ariano, P. Perinotti, and R. F. Werner, *Clean positive operator valued measures*, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **46**, 082109 (2005).
- [10] D. Blackwell, *Equivalent comparisons of experiments*, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **24**, 265 (1953).
- [11] F. Buscemi, *Comparison of quantum statistical models: Equivalent conditions for sufficiency*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **310**, 625 (2012).
- [12] M. Dall’Arno, F. Buscemi, A. Bisio, and A. Tosini, *Data-driven inference, reconstruction, and observational completeness of quantum devices*, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 062407 (2020).
- [13] M. Dall’Arno, A. Ho, F. Buscemi, and V. Scarani, *Data-driven inference and observational completeness of quantum devices*, [arXiv:1905.04895](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.04895).
- [14] F. John, *Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions*, in *Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday*, 187–204, (Interscience Publishers, New York, 1948).
- [15] W. Słomczyński and A. Szymusiak, *Morphophoric POVMs, generalised qplexes, and 2-designs*, *Quantum* **4**, 338 (2020).
- [16] A. Szymusiak and W. Słomczyński, *Can QBism exist without Q? Morphophoric measurements in generalised probabilistic theories*, [arXiv:2302.04957](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04957).
- [17] C. A. Fuchs, *QBism, the Perimeter of Quantum Bayesianism*, [arXiv:1003.5209](https://arxiv.org/abs/1003.5209).
- [18] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, *Quantum-Bayesian coherence*, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **85**, 1693 (2013).
- [19] C. A. Fuchs, N. D. Mermin, and R. Schack, *An introduction to QBism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics*, *American Journal of Physics* **82**, 749 (2014).